

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The present application contains claims 1-3, 5-7, 9, 10 and 18. Claims 1, 3, 5, 9 and 18 have been amended. Claims 4, 8, 11-17 and 19 have been cancelled. Claims 13-17 have been cancelled by way of a previous amendment and claims 4, 8, 11-13 and 19 have been cancelled by way of this amendment.

Telephonic Interview

Applicant wishes to thank Examiner Hsu and the Examiner's Supervisory Patent Examiner, Tuan Ho, for the courtesy of conducting a telephone interview on April 15, 2008, and for the helpful comments provided during the interview in order to expedite the prosecution of the present application.

Making reference to the Office Action Summary, it is noted that a three-month response period has been set for responding to the Final Office Action. It is submitted that this amendment, accompanied by an RCE, has been timely filed.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102

Making reference to the Detailed Action, claims 1, 3-5, 7-9, 11-13 and 18-19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Masahide Hirasawa, (U.S. Patent No. 6,980,233) (hereinafter, "Hirasawa"). Claims 4, 8, 11-13 and 19 having been cancelled without prejudice to Applicant in order to expedite the

prosecution of the present application, this rejection is respectfully traversed as regards claims 1-3, 5, 7, 9 and 18.

Hirasawa is limited to teaching that the camera shown in Fig. 20, **automatically** comes under the control of personal computer 103 upon detection that the IEEE 1394 cable is electrically connected between the PC 103 and the camera interface 2629.

To the contrary, the present invention, as can best be understood from Figs. 3A and 3B, teaches that the PC is initially in control of the camera setting control data at step S22, for example, and, each time a setting is changed, the camera automatically photographs at S25, image conditions are transferred at S26, and the image is displayed at step S27. Manual control takes place by selecting either, at step 28 to allow the camera to be the master, in which case steps S28-S33 are performed, or alternatively, to manually select the Start Capture Mode shown in step 34, whereby the program then jumps to the Capture Mode procedure at step S35, the Capture Mode procedure being shown in greater detail in Figs. 4A and 4B.

In support of this distinction over Hirasawa, claim 1 has been amended to change "a selector configured to select between a first photographing mode..." to read "a selector configured to **manually** select between a first photographing mode in which..." Claim 1 has been further amended at the last line thereof to change "in accordance with the selection by the selector" to read "in accordance with **manual**

operation of the selector." The features are neither taught or remotely suggested by Hirasawa. These differences were also pointed out during a telephone interview with Examiner Hsu and her Supervisory Examiner Tuan Ho and Examiner Hsu during the interview, as well as in an Interview Summary dated April 21, 2008, indicated that the above distinctions are not taught by Hirasawa and therefore, it is submitted that claim 1 patentably distinguishes thereover. Claims 2 and 3 depend from claim 1 and carry all of its limitations and hence are deemed to patentably distinguish over Hirasawa for the same reasons set forth above regarding claim 1.

Claim 5 has been amended in a manner similar to claim 1 and it is submitted that claim 5 patentably distinguishes over Hirasawa. Claims 6 and 7 depend from claim 5 and carry all of its limitations and hence are deemed to patentably distinguish over Hirasawa for the same reasons set forth above regarding claim 5 as well as claim 1.

Claim 9 has been amended in a manner similar to claims 1 and 5, and it is submitted that claim 9 patentably distinguishes over Hirasawa. Claim 10 depends from claim 9 and carries all of its limitations and hence is deemed to patentably distinguish over Hirasawa for the same reasons set forth above regarding claim 9, as well as claims 1 and 5, for example.

Claim 18 has been amended in a manner similar to claims 1, 5 and 9 and it is submitted that claim 18 patentably distinguishes over Hirasawa.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1-3, 5, 7, 9 and 18 patentably distinguishes over Hirasawa and it is submitted that the rejection under Section 102(e) should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 2, 6 and 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is unpatentable over Hirasawa. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner admits that Hirasawa fails to teach that images are transmitted to the external apparatus each time a photo is taken under the control of the camera, stating that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teaching of Hirasawa by allowing the taught system to transfer an image taken under the control of the camera to the external apparatus every time a picture is taken, based on the Examiner's assumption that the external apparatus can have a much larger display that will allow the user to look at the result with more ease and in more detail in order to be able to change aspects of the pictures such as hue and color density while observing the results clearly on a large display.

Even assuming for argument purposes that the Examiner's position is proper, it should be noted that claim 2 depends on claim 1 and, since Hirasawa lacks the manual capability set forth above urging patentability of claim 1 over Hirasawa, it

is submitted that claim 2 patentably distinguishes over Hirasawa for the same reasons set forth above regarding claim 1.

Claim 6 depends from claim 5 and it is submitted that claim 6 patentably distinguishes over Hirasawa due to the manual control capabilities set forth in claim 5, as amended.

Claim 10 depends from claim 9 and carries all of its limitations and it is submitted that claim 10 patentably distinguishes over Hirasawa due to a lack of teaching of the manual capabilities as set forth in claim 9, as amended.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1-3, 5-7, 9, 10 and 18 patentably distinguish over Hirasawa and reconsideration and allowance of these claims are earnestly solicited.


Conclusion

If the Examiner believes that any additional minor formal matters need to be addressed in order to place this application in condition for allowance, or that a telephone interview will help to materially advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone at the Examiner's convenience.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application, including claims 1-3, 5-7, 9, 10 and 18, are in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Oura et al.

By 
Louis Weinstein
Registration No. 20,477

Volpe and Koenig, P.C.
United Plaza, Suite 1600
30 South 17th Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-6400
Facsimile: (215) 568-6499

LW/hg
Enclosures